



THE INCIDENTS OF THE LECOMPTON STRUGGLE IN CONGRESS
AND THE CAMPAIGN OF 1858 IN ILLINOIS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM KELLOGG, OF ILLINOIS.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, March 13, 1860.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois, said :

Mr. CHAIRMAN : At an early day in this session of Congress, I felt it my duty to reply to what I deemed a violent and gross attack upon me by the editor of the *New York Tribune*. During my remarks, I mentioned, in connection with Mr. Greeley, the editor of that paper, the name of Judge DOUGLAS, placing them, as it was claimed, by inference, in political connection. My object then was only to rebuke Mr. Greeley for his assault upon me, and to place him in what I esteemed his true position before the country, in relation to, and connection with, the political campaign in Illinois in 1858.

[Mr. COVODE being about to leave the Hall, Mr. KELLOGG said : I hope my friend from Pennsylvania will not leave the Hall, as I shall refer to him during my remarks, and direct his attention to some points that I shall suggest, and ask of him a statement in relation thereto.]

This object alone induced the charge I made in my former remarks. In those remarks I made this statement :

“That Mr. Greeley was, again and again, with others, in consultation in the parlor of Judge Douglas, planning and scheming the election of Judge Douglas to the Senate of the United States from the State of Illinois.”

That is the language of my proposition, after I had been requested to restate it in definite language. This language is plain, and beyond controversy as to its construction. I have sought the floor on this occasion for the purpose of making good that statement ; I have sought it for the purpose of presenting such proofs and arguments as I may, to sustain the

promise that I made on the second day after that, that I would present my proofs in due and proper time after the House should be organized.

Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to deal fairly in this matter, and to give this assertion of mine its full, proper, and just scope and construction. I wish to take nothing by narrowing down this issue. I wish to state it clearly, to meet it fairly ; and I propose to do it now. The proposition I made was, substantially, that there was a disposition upon the part of Greeley and other Republicans to secure the election of Judge DOUGLAS to the Senate of the United States ; and my colleagues on the other side of this House, I understand, hold that, by implication and fair construction, Judge DOUGLAS was charged as assenting thereto, by reason of the allegation that the conferences were held in his house. Now, that is as full and fair a statement of the case as my colleagues or any other gentleman can ask me to make. In other words, I assumed that there was an attempted coalition between Greeley, other Republicans, and Judge DOUGLAS, to secure his [DOUGLAS's] re-election to the Senate. I was surprised, I confess, that the friends of Judge DOUGLAS should have taken the alarm ; and that they should have thought it necessary to take upon themselves the defence of Mr. Greeley ; and I was astonished when Judge DOUGLAS sent his letter here, denying the statement that I had made, unless they considered that any connection with Mr. Greeley was so infamous as to require of him at once to repel an imputation so foul, and therefore deny the intimation that Greeley could have been working to secure his [DOUGLAS's] re-election. But now, sir, to the proofs.

With a view to a full and proper understand-

ing of this matter, and in order that we may not be deceived in relation to our deductions and conclusions, it is important that we should appreciate the exact position of Judge DOUGLAS at that time, as well as the position of those whom I charge were confederating with him. I assume, then, sir, that Judge DOUGLAS, during that winter, was a candidate for United States Senator from the State of Illinois. I propose to show that he was known to be a candidate for the Senate of the United States during the session of Congress in which the Lecompton Constitution was discussed. The proof I shall present of that fact will be drawn from the records of this House, as they are found compiled in the Congressional Globe. And I desire to say that, in reading extracts from the speeches of the honorable member from Virginia, [Mr. SMITH,] and the honorable member from Kentucky, [Mr. BURNETT,] I have only in view the establishing of the fact that Judge DOUGLAS was known to be a candidate for the Senate of the United States. His term in that body was then about expiring; and, further, when these conferences and political meetings were held, it was known on the part of Republicans that he was a candidate, and that he was doubly anxious for a re-election, because of the peculiar relation he then held to the Democratic party.

Mr. Chairman, I read from the Congressional Globe of March, 1858. Mr. SMITH, of Virginia, says:

"I stated on that occasion, and my purpose is to repeat with, if possible, more distinctness than then, that after this Congress had commenced its session—I do not recollect the exact time—in a free conversation on public questions with the honorable gentleman from Illinois, he stated to me distinctly, explicitly, and precisely, according to my present recollection and my past recollection, that the Illinois delegation held a conference as to the policy that a distinguished Senator—Judge DOUGLAS—should pursue on this Lecompton question, with a view to securing his re-election to the Senate of the United States, and that the one he has pursued is the only course by which he could hope to effect it. I have said this in private conversation on various occasions. It was the result of a very distinct recollection. I stated this yesterday; and I repeat it to-day as my recollection—a recollection clear, distinct, and emphatic."

The gentleman referred to was Mr. MORRIS, of Illinois, as reported in the Globe. Again, sir, I read from the remarks made on the same day by Mr. BURNETT, of Kentucky. He said:

"He commenced by speaking of the position which had been taken by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and by his colleagues in this House, upon the Kansas question. I understood him distinctly to say that, upon a conference of the friends of Judge DOUGLAS, (the friends from Illinois,) it had been agreed that he should take the course he has pursued

'in reference to the Kansas question, as the only means by which he could sustain himself at home. That unless he did take that course, he would not only inevitably suffer defeat at home himself, but his friends would fall with him."

Mr. LOGAN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I will yield for a question.

Mr. LOGAN. Do you not know that that statement was denied upon this floor by Mr. MORRIS, of Illinois, and by Judge Marshall, who represented the district I now represent?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. When interrupted, I was just about making that statement.

Mr. LOGAN. I want to say, further, that I do not care who made the statement that there was ever a conference of the Illinois delegation in reference to the course of action by Judge DOUGLAS on the Lecompton question, at any time—I, of course, know nothing of the matter myself, not being here—it was denied here upon this floor; and I am satisfied that it was utterly untrue and false. I will state that I knew the course Judge DOUGLAS would take, long previous to his coming to the Senate.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. The gentleman must excuse me, but I cannot yield any more of my time. That is not the point I am making.

Mr. LOGAN. I only want to get in here that, so far as any understanding of that kind is concerned, it is wholly untrue; I do not care who made the statement.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. When my colleague interrupted me, I was about to make a statement as to the matter to which he has referred. I have no disposition to enter into any difficulty which has arisen, or may arise, between the gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman from Virginia, and my colleagues. I was in the House at the time, and heard all that transpired. I know that Mr. MORRIS, of Illinois, and his Democratic colleagues, did deny that there had been any conference; whereupon the statement I have read was made. Mr. MORRIS, of Illinois, denied it in emphatic terms. Mr. SMITH, of Virginia, made his statement; and Mr. BURNETT, of Kentucky, made his, in corroboration of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is immaterial to my purpose. I make no issue on that point. I have read these extracts for the sole object of showing that Judge DOUGLAS was a candidate, and known to be a candidate, for the Senate of the United States. That proposition I have never heard denied. It was not denied then, and I presume that it will not be denied now. I wish to make these propositions fairly, and there is no desire on my part to bring up matters outside of this case. I only feel called upon to vindicate my own position.

Now, sir, having thus shown that Judge DOUGLAS was a candidate for the Senate, I propose to show that there were conferences at his

house. I do not, however, esteem it important to the discussion of this question, whether they were at his house or not; for, sir, I think this will make no difference as to the fact, whether, if any coalition took place, it was made at a hotel, in his own house, in his library, or upon the street corners. The point here is: Did Republicans seek to make a coalition with Judge DOUGLAS? That is the point I am after. I will now attempt to prove it, and to show that Judge DOUGLAS was a party to that attempted coalition.

The first evidence I bring in proof that there were political conferences at the house of Judge DOUGLAS is the letter that my colleague [Mr. MORRIS] procured to be read at the Clerk's desk, and which is now a part of the record of the country. It is the letter Mr. Greeley addressed to me. It seems that I had brought down upon me the anathema of Horace Greeley, of the New York *Tribune*, for an act of mine during this Congress, and one which I believed I had the right, and it was my duty, to perform.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I would rather not. I have hardly time enough to say all that I desire to.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I wish only to suggest, that if the gentleman will consent, I will move that the Committee rise, in order that he may go on with his remarks to-morrow. [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I will go on with my remarks as far as I can this evening. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Missouri for his kindness.

Mr. Chairman, before I refer to this letter, however, I wish to say, that in that long letter, addressed to me, there was much which I esteem scurrilous, unbecoming the pen or tongue of a gentleman of his position. I pass over that, because it refers solely to myself and to my constituents, and that matter I will not bring before this House. I will settle that with my constituents; they will scrutinize my conduct. And let me here say, that if I have not a securer lodgment in the hearts of my constituents than has Mr. Horace Greeley, I will not ask to come back to Congress again. I read from his letter:

"Senator DOUGLAS and I have been acquaintances for ten years or more, during which time each has given and taken hard blows, but I trust no foul ones. I am willing to call the account balanced, if he is. Once only in our lives did we agree on a political question—that of resisting the attempt to force an abhorred Constitution on the people of Kansas. During the struggle on that point, I was called to Washington, and went to his house, where we had two conversations on pending political topics. There was at least one witness in each instance, and that witness

is now a Republican member of the House. Never before nor since have Mr. DOUGLAS and I conversed on politics, save as opponents; and on that occasion I am glad to have a witness to confirm my own clear recollection that Mr. DOUGLAS's re-election to the Senate, or his future election to any post whatever, was not even mentioned. And never did any letter, message, or word, pass between us, implying a desire on his part that I should, or a promise on mine that I would, support him, at any time, for any office whatever. And whoever has at any time reported to you aught inconsistent with this, must have drawn on his imagination for his facts, or be laboring under the grossest misapprehension.

"Mr. KELLOGG, there is just one remaining tie of sympathy between Senator DOUGLAS and myself, now that the old relations of political antagonism between us are completely re-established. I detest his doctrines, but I like his PLUCK. Had he signed, ever so heedlessly, a circular recommending Tom Paine's Age of Reason, you would never have found him prevaricating, nor apologizing, nor deprecating; he would have simply and coolly told his adversaries to make the most of it. Oh that some Republicans could be not merely almost, but altogether, such as he is in this respect, however unlike in every other!

"HORACE GREELEY."

Mr. Chairman, this declaration of Horace Greeley has additional force, from the fact that my colleague [Mr. MORRIS] has placed it upon the records as evidence against me, and therefore he is estopped from denying all it proves. What does it prove? It establishes the fact, by irresistible inference, that Judge DOUGLAS, known to be a candidate for the United States Senate, and known to be at that time in opposition to a large portion of the Democratic party, induced Mr. Greeley to come to Washington for the purpose of political consultation; and that he went to the house of the Senator, upon two several occasions, upon such missions. I ask you if there was no meeting at his house for the purpose of political consultation? If there was not, then this letter does not speak the truth. And now, sir, let any honest man answer to himself, who called Greeley to Washington; and why, immediately after his arrival, he went to the house of Judge DOUGLAS, and did not find his ultimate destination upon that mission of coalition until he reached the Senator's parlor? and he will answer to his own heart that it was as I have indicated. Twice was he there in political consultation with Mr. DOUGLAS.

Mr. LARRABEE. I would ask the gentleman if he thinks Brigham Young sent for Horace Greeley to come to his home when he went there?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. The gentleman seems troubled. I tell him this is but a drop in the bucket.

Mr. LARRABEE. Let us have the balance.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. This is but one link in the chain of evidence which I have to offer. It is said in this letter that there were more in that conference—at least one Republican member of Congress, and by fair intendment more; it was more than a meeting of DOUGLAS and Greeley upon each of those occasions. Who were they? Let him who knows best answer. Let Judge DOUGLAS tell you how many Republicans were there. I have shown, by their own evidence, that there were two more, and, by fair inference, more; but who they were does not appear. It is true that Greeley says that he never promised to support DOUGLAS. I never said he did. But I do say they were preparing for that result, and paving the way that led to his willing and hearty support. What was the object and motive of this meeting, if not for the purpose I have stated? No other rational solution of the matter can be given. It was a conference upon political subjects, and had no other significance. I do not propose to say that I can prove that there was a direct pledge; they know each other too well, perhaps, for that. Perhaps Greeley never said to DOUGLAS, "I will support you." Perhaps DOUGLAS never said to Greeley, "you must aid me in my election." But they were in political conference, Judge DOUGLAS being a candidate for re-election. And now, having proved that there was a meeting there upon that subject, I shall prove, by the fruits of that meeting, its real motives—it always being a safe rule to judge a tree by its fruits—and that the immediate object was to find out the exact *status* of Mr. DOUGLAS on the exciting political questions of the day, which he was willing to disclose, as will hereafter appear, that their future action might be with reference to it.

Mr. COLFAX. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLOGG] asks who were the Republicans present. Does he want an answer to that question?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. If the gentleman desires to tell, and will tell all, I will give way.

Several MEMBERS. Let him tell.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. This is getting a little interesting now, and I want it set right. If the gentleman will state, as I will ask him to state, all that transpired between himself and Judge DOUGLAS, in relation to the coalition with the Republicans in the State of Illinois and in the State of Missouri, I will yield to him.

Mr. COLFAX. The gentleman from Illinois was speaking in relation to one point. He wished to know what Republican members were present. He says he desires me to state, if I will state everything that transpired between Judge DOUGLAS and myself. I must be permitted to be the judge of what I shall state, and what I shall not state. If the gentleman desires to know anything in reference to this

interview, I feel myself at liberty to allude to the matter, as both the gentlemen concerned in the interview have referred to me as witness; but my own self-respect must be the judge as to what I shall say in regard to other parties and other matters. If the gentleman desires to hear me, I will state what I have to say very frankly; if not, I will refrain.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. McCLERNAND. The gentleman from Indiana has been challenged to make a statement, and I hope he will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Who challenged him?

Mr. McCLERNAND. Do not shrink.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I do not shrink. I have not called upon the witness; but now I insist that he shall answer. And I insist that he shall answer, not only in reference to that part of the subject to which I have alluded, but in reference also to a conference between himself and Judge DOUGLAS, in reference to Mr. Blair being returned to the Senate from the State of Missouri as a Republican. Let the gentleman make a clean breast of it.

Mr. COLFAX. I will state that there were two members of Congress present at that interview between Judge DOUGLAS and Mr. Greeley. Those two gentlemen were Mr. CLARK B. COCHRANE, of New York, and myself. Mr. Greeley was in this city on business. What called him here I do not now remember. Mr. COCHRANE, I think, suggested that Mr. Greeley should call upon Judge DOUGLAS. The interviews were not very long, and they were not private—that is to say, nothing was said which could not have been said publicly upon the streets. I have taxed my memory to recall all that was said, and think I can state it fully.

Both of those gentlemen—Judge DOUGLAS and Mr. Greeley—have referred to me as proof of what transpired, or I should not here, or anywhere else, on the demand of any person, have spoken in regard to them.

There was nothing said about the Senatorial election in Illinois, to the best of my knowledge, recollection, or belief. I am positive that the Senatorial election was not referred to. The only subject of a political character referred to was the Lecompton Constitution, which was then pending before Congress; the necessity of its rejection, and the means by which its success could be averted. They were talked of frankly and freely. Nothing was then said by Judge DOUGLAS which he had not before said publicly. He is politically hostile to me, and I desire to see him, if a nominee for the Presidency, defeated. But I bear this testimony because it is due to him.

There was one other subject discussed. That was, the rise of property in Chicago, which, I suppose, has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman from Indiana if, in that conference, the position of Judge DOUGLAS upon the slavery question was not discussed?

Mr. COLFAX. It was not; except that he said he intended to resist the Lecompton Constitution to the bitter end, regardless of the results to himself.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I ask if his position upon the slavery question was not discussed?

Mr. COLFAX. It was not, to my recollection.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Now, I want to know if Judge DOUGLAS and yourself did not have a conference, or if you were not the bearer of dispatches to Mr. Blair, in reference to his election from the State of Missouri to the United States Senate.

Mr. COLFAX. After the canvass which resulted in my election to this Congress, in October, 1858, had closed, I went over into Illinois to make ten or a dozen speeches against Judge DOUGLAS's election to the United States Senate. In going to the different places appointed for me to speak by the Republican State Central Committee, the Buchanan men, at nearly every one of those places, sent to me written questions, asking me if I had not been the bearer of a letter from Judge DOUGLAS to Mr. Blair, in relation to the Senatorial election in Missouri; and asking me to answer them while on the stand. To those questions, I responded publicly at two or three places—at Decatur, Jacksonville, &c.—what I respond here: that whatever conversations were had between Judge DOUGLAS and myself, during the exciting Lecompton controversy, were had in his own private house, under his own roof; and my own self-respect forbids my alluding to them, or giving any evidence in regard to them, except at his demand.

I state, further, that if there was any conference between Mr. Blair, of Missouri, and Judge DOUGLAS, Mr. Blair is in this city. He was a member of the last Congress, and occupied a seat here the whole of last winter, after this alleged interview had transpired; and it would have been better to call upon him, as a member and as a principal in this matter, to give his evidence, than to call on me.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I wonder, now, if that is satisfactory to my friends on the other side?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. If it does not come out of my time, I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana if there was a conference between Judge DOUGLAS and himself in relation to the Senatorial election in Missouri? I do not ask him what it was, but simply if there was such a conference?

Mr. COLFAX. We never had any confer-

ence in reference to the Senatorial election in Missouri. I answer the gentleman's question exactly as he stated it. If there was any conference between Judge DOUGLAS and Mr. Blair, in reference to that matter, they are of age, and let them speak for themselves.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. Did Judge DOUGLAS and Mr. Blair ever have a conference in your presence upon that subject?

Mr. COLFAX. No, sir.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I will ask the gentleman if he carried a message from Judge DOUGLAS to Mr. Blair, asking for a conference upon that subject?

Mr. COLFAX. I state to the gentleman, if my self-respect in Illinois, and my opinion as to the rule which should govern the intercourse between gentlemen, made me refuse to answer questions upon that subject, when I earnestly desired to defeat Judge DOUGLAS's election, then pending, I certainly should not now, two years after that, have a different standard of action.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. It is due to myself to say that I did not provoke these questions and answers. The gentleman [Mr. COLFAX] has seen fit voluntarily to come forward and to take up the cause of Judge DOUGLAS in relation to this charge of a concerted political conference between DOUGLAS and Greeley. This he has seen fit to do with regard to the conference, but he has, at the same time, refused to give us an account of the other conversation between Judge DOUGLAS and himself. I appeal to him in the hope of developing the truth. I appeal to him to add strength to the proofs I submit to the country, so as to let the people know the political position occupied by the prominent men of the country; and, strange as it may appear, he allows his self-respect to overshadow him like a cloud, and there he sits mum before me. [Loud laughter.] I am unable to appreciate the gentleman's great delicacy in this case, unless the disclosures might compromise his confidential adviser, Judge DOUGLAS.

Mr. COLFAX. I did so in this case only because I had been appealed to by both parties as a witness.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I leave that, sir. I have demonstrated this fact: that Judge DOUGLAS and Greeley, by some strange fatality, came together, and my friend from Indiana with them. Greeley came from New York on a call, and he landed at the house of Judge DOUGLAS, taking his friends with him, one on each side. Gentlemen who play euchre, perhaps, would call them the "right and left bowlers." [Laughter.] I do not know that that is exactly the term.

A MEMBER. No—"a bully and bragger." [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I never saw such ignorance of terms before as there is all

around me here. They are as ignorant as I am myself on such subjects. [Laughter.]

I have established the fact that there were political conferences and political advising. But it is suggested that it was in relation to the Lecompton measure only. Now, I ask you, sir, and every honest man, what did Judge DOUGLAS expect to get from the Republicans in that struggle by those consultations? Every man of the Republican party was pledged against that measure from the moment we set our feet in the city of Washington; and never, until the struggle was over, was there faltering, or the intimation that one Republican would falter. I ask, then, for what purpose Greeley was brought to the aid of Judge DOUGLAS? I hope some one will answer, who can tell how we were to strengthen Judge DOUGLAS's hands.

Mr. Chairman, what could Greeley do to aid in getting Democratic votes? What agencies had he, that would bring strength from the Democracy to Judge DOUGLAS in his position? In the House they had taken their position; and you and I, sir, know it, [addressing the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DAVIS.] I ask, could Greeley influence you and your friends to go more strongly with Judge DOUGLAS on that question than before? No; you answer no. Then it was not to strengthen your back or stiffen up your purpose. For whom, then, was it? In the Senate, the noble and gallant Broderick on the one hand, and the Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. Stuart] upon the other, had also, before that, taken their position. What could Greeley do in that conference or consultation to aid in the defeat of that measure? Ah! sir, nothing—absolutely nothing. Now, there was a reason why they were there; and, in my judgment, it was this: there was a defection in the Democratic camp, and Judge DOUGLAS had broken away from the regular army, and was engaged in a guerilla warfare on the Administration. What did Greeley and the Republicans most want? To defeat the Democrats; to defeat the Administration. What, in God's name, did DOUGLAS want? Most unquestionably, he wanted to defeat the Administration, and to thereby sustain himself. He was just slipping out of power; he was just dying out from the Senate; and, unless he could secure a re-election, he was overwhelmed, and would sink out of sight. Hence a Senatorial position was to be regained at any sacrifice and on any terms. The Republicans wanted to beat the Democracy; and many of them were reckless of the means of its accomplishment. DOUGLAS wanted to beat the Administration, and would make any coalition to accomplish it. The *status* and condition of Judge DOUGLAS was to be considered and understood before it was safe for the Republicans to sustain him. I said a little while ago that I do not suppose they *promised*. Old politicians make but few positive promises; but when

Greeley saw the condition of Judge DOUGLAS, and Judge DOUGLAS found the disposition of Greeley, it was a basis on which they could strike out in their future action.

Mr. Chairman, there is strong evidence of one other meeting; and now, in order to show that there was a very strange gathering at the Senator's, I will read a quotation from the *New York Tribune*. That quotation is a dispatch from this city to the *New York Tribune*, which will be found in a letter to the *Washington Union*, under date of August 22, 1858. It is as follows:

"The Republican Senators held a consultation last night with Senator DOUGLAS, at his house, which was satisfactory to both parties."

Mr. McCLEARNAND. Who is the author of that?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. It is from a letter in the *Washington Union*, of the date I have indicated, signed "Northwest." I cite it because it is quoted here as a dispatch that appeared in the *New York Tribune*.

Mr. LOGAN. Will my colleague allow me to ask him who "Northwest" is? Is he any relation to the great Northwest that we hear of—Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio—or what is he?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. That must be about the last interruption I shall get from that quarter, I judge. [Laughter.] I cite this to show that there was a dispatch sent from Washington indicating that there was a consultation of Republican Senators with Judge DOUGLAS, at his own house; and while it may be news to my Democratic colleagues who are present, there are those who hear me who know that it is a part of the history of those times. Here was a definite charge made in the *Washington Union*, the authoritative organ of the Democratic party, that there had been a consultation of Republican Senators at the house of Judge DOUGLAS, and that both parties were satisfied therewith.

Mr. FOUKE. Will my colleague permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOUKE. At what date did that consultation take place between Judge DOUGLAS and Republican Senators?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. This letter was written, as I have before stated, in August, 1858, and it refers to a dispatch, which, it states, had been before that sent to the *Tribune*.

Mr. FOUKE. My colleague knows who were the Republican Senators at that day?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I suppose I do.

Mr. FOUKE. They are now in the city, most of them, are they not?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I presume so.

Mr. FOUKE. I would ask my colleague if he has ever tried to get this information from the Republican Senators now in this city. I believe, according to the law, it is always better to produce the most direct proof of which the case is susceptible, than to go round and

get the declaration of some "Northwest" upon the subject.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I am obliged to my other colleague for his most luminous exposition of the law. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, it is true, and many of those who hear me know that it is a part of the history of those times, that these consultations were spoken of publicly in the streets; that Senators did hold these consultations. I do not know, I have not stopped to inquire, who they were. If gentlemen want to find out who these Republican Senators were, let them inquire, and they will find that there was more complicity in this coalition than they now dream of.

I now propose to read a letter from a gentleman in Illinois, in relation to these meetings at the Senator's house, and I think it will be admitted as pretty good evidence:

"PEORIA, ILL., Jan. 6, 1860.

"SIR: Your favor of January 2d is received, and contents noted. In reply, I would say, that while in Washington last week, I was informed, by a prominent and responsible Democrat, who had the means of knowing, that Senator WILSON, and other prominent Republicans in and out of Congress, during and after the discussion of the Lecompton Constitution in Congress, were frequently in private political consultation at the house of Judge DOUGLAS; and I do know, that afterwards the New York Tribune did favor the election of Judge DOUGLAS to the United States Senate; and that extracts from that journal, so favoring him, were copied in several of the Democratic papers in the State of Illinois during the campaign of 1858.

"I am prepared to give the name of the gentleman from whom I received the information, when it can have any practical good effect.

"Respectfully, yours, G. W. RANEY.

"To Hon. William Kellogg,
Washington, D. C."

Mr. LOGAN. Will the gentleman inform me who this Mr. Raney is?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. He is the postmaster appointed by the President of the United States for the city of Peoria.

Mr. LOGAN. Is he not an enemy of Judge DOUGLAS?

Mr. McCLERNAND. I believe in this letter the statement is, that he was so informed.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Yes, sir; and will give his authority, if necessary.

Mr. LOGAN. Very good, I have no doubt.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. There is another weak fire from a small battery. I hope it will soon be silenced, and then they will all be silenced. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOGAN. Go ahead.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Now, sir, I come to another proposition, which is, the motive of these consultations. Why did Senators

meet at that house in consultation, and how were both parties satisfied?

Mr. LOGAN. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I cannot yield again. You see my time is passing away, and I shall not be able to get through before my hour will have expired.

Mr. LOGAN. I simply want to ask my colleague, and I hope it will not be taken out of his time, whether this Mr. Raney, whose letter he has just read, is not a known enemy of Judge DOUGLAS?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I will state that Mr. Raney is a violent party man.

Mr. LOGAN. That does not answer the question.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. And I will state that he is a Democrat, and at the head of the Democratic party, as I believe, in the county and city of Peoria. He belongs to that wing of the Democratic party known as the Administration or Buchanan Democracy. He has been a warm friend of Judge DOUGLAS. He is now, I believe, politically opposed to him.

Mr. LOGAN. An enemy to him, in short.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. You must settle these matters among yourselves. He is opposed, as I understand, to the nomination of Judge DOUGLAS at Charleston.

Mr. LOGAN. And, I take it, gives you this statement in order to injure Judge DOUGLAS.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. When he was in this city, I saw him and conversed with him upon the subject of the statements I had made. He intimated that he had some knowledge upon that subject. After his return I wrote him, and in reply received the letter I have read.

Now, sir, I have shown that these conferences were held; and, now, will any gentleman tell me that all these meetings were held night after night and day after day, without arranging and concocting some political scheme? Will any gentleman tell me that, in these repeated conferences of Senators and others, they had one sole motive, one single political measure in view, and that the Lecompton question, which could in no way be affected by them? No, sir. Having shown that they were in conference by night and by day, in private and in public, I propose now to show what were the fruits of that coalition or attempted coalition.

I stated that Greeley was conniving and scheming to accomplish the election of Judge DOUGLAS. At the time I made the statement, my colleague denied that Greeley had favored the re-election of Judge DOUGLAS in the State of Illinois. Well, sir, I propose to judge of this tree by its fruits. I now propose to show that, growing out of these secret meetings, from this time and place of conspiracy, the first fruits were borne and seen in this very House. Meetings at midnight had taken place; meetings under the shadow of the wall had been held,

and it was time now to feel the political public pulse; it was time to inquire how the people would stand this matter of confederacy between sworn enemies. Well, sir, the experiment was tried. Here, standing not five feet from where now I stand, a Republican Representative from the State of Massachusetts came out and proclaimed for DOUGLAS. I will read it from the Globe:

"I think it the first duty of Republicans to 'extinguish the doughfaces, but I hold it also 'their duty to bear testimony as to the manner 'in which the DOUGLAS men—and they will 'pardon me for giving them the name of their 'gallant and gifted leader—to bear testimony 'to the manner in which they have borne themselves. They have kept the faith. * * *

"I say it is due to them that we should say 'that they have borne the brunt of the battle, 'and that they, whether from New York, Pennsylvania, or Illinois, have kept the whiteness 'of their souls, and have made a record which 'has lain in light; and if my voice can have 'any weight with the young men of the country where those men dwell, I should say to them, 'Stand by these men with all your 'young enthusiasm. Stand by them without 'distinction of party.' "

Mr. McCLEARNAND. Who was that?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Mr. BURLINGAME, of Massachusetts. [Laughter.] That is a name I know Democrats love to honor. Here was a pointing to the future. They had ascertained the position of the DOUGLAS men, for they had been in consultation with them. After they had consulted with Greeley, and after Senators and after men outside of Congress had consulted, it was left to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BURLINGAME] to make the first public demonstration in this House in favor of the DOUGLAS element. He said here that "they had kept the whiteness of their souls," and that their "record was laid in light;" and he called upon the young men, with all their young enthusiasm, to go for the DOUGLAS men. Just in advance was the great struggle in Illinois. DOUGLAS was a candidate for the Senator from that State. The day before the speech of Mr. BURLINGAME, the speeches were made from which I have read. Knowing that Judge DOUGLAS was a candidate, knowing that the great struggle for the Senate was to come off in Illinois, he boldly and publicly proclaimed himself in favor of the DOUGLAS men in the State of Illinois. He knew, sir, that the political element which sustained the DOUGLAS Democratic members of Congress in that election, would also sustain the election of members of the Legislature who were in favor of the defeat of the patriot Lincoln and the election of DOUGLAS to the United States Senate; and that anything that secured the election of a majority of the members of the Legislature of the DOUGLAS school of politics, carried DOUGLAS into the Senate of the United

States. That is the first fruit, the outcrop of this conspiracy, which I believe was schemed, concocted, and counselled, in the very conference of which I have spoken.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's hour has now expired.

Mr. CURRY obtained the floor.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I ask the gentleman to yield to me, to conclude my remarks.

Mr. CURRY. I have no desire to participate in this Illinois controversy; and if it does not come out of my time, I am willing to yield, that it may go on this evening. I will yield to the gentleman and his colleagues who may desire to reply, if it is the understanding that I shall be entitled to the floor in the morning. I do not want to go on with my remarks this evening, in any event.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the proposition to the House. The gentleman from Alabama is entitled to the floor, and he is willing to yield it, provided he shall have the floor to-morrow.

Mr. CURRY. Then, with the understanding that I shall have the floor to-morrow, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Committee for this mark of its courtesy. I propose to show one other fruit of what I esteem a part of this coalition. Immediately after this demonstration in the House, Horace Greeley, whom I have already mentioned, himself endeavored to secure the election of Judge DOUGLAS. I read from a letter addressed to me by Mr. Bailhache, of the *Illinois State Journal*, in relation to his conversation with Mr. Greeley, in which he says:

"OFFICE DAILY ILLINOIS STATE JOURNAL.
"Springfield, December 13, 1859

"DEAR SIR: * * * I myself had a conversation with Greeley, in his own office, in August, 1858, in which he said, substantially, 'that we (Illinois Republicans) had made a great mistake in not taking up DOUGLAS as our candidate for the Senate; and, further, that we would one day acknowledge the fact. I was indignant, and told him we did not desire success upon such terms; that it would demoralize our party in Illinois, &c.; whereupon he said some other party would arise in its place, and more of the same sort. His influence (in Illinois at least) ought to be broken, and I hope it will be. * * *

"Yours,
"Hon. Wm. Kellogg. Per Bailhache."

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. In the letter I have read here, there is a clear indication of the feeling and disposition of Mr. Greeley.

Mr. LOGAN. Will my colleague state who Mr. Bailhache is, what his politics are, and what paper he is editor of?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I have already

said that Mr. Bailhache is the editor of the *Illinois State Journal*, published at Springfield, Illinois; and he is a true and pure Republican. Here is his statement of his conference with Mr. Greeley, in relation to the great contest then going on in the State of Illinois; and there Greeley distinctly avows his preference for Mr. DOUGLAS—and mark, that was after the conference at Washington; after the contest had commenced—with a view to induce him to desist from his opposition to Mr. L. N.coln, and his adherence to Judge DOUGLAS, in that election. He replied to an Illinois Republican that we had made a mistake. Now, how did he know that there had been a mistake made? If he knew at all, he must have derived his information from the consultations he had had with Judge DOUGLAS himself, or he could not have spoken as confidently as he did. But, irrespective of that, it fixes beyond all controversy the truth of my position, that he was scheming and endeavoring to elect Judge DOUGLAS to the Senate of the United States. But what strikes me with more astonishment, with more absolute surprise, is the fact that, when he was told that the course he was pursuing would demoralize and destroy the Republican party in Illinois, he coolly declared that, if it did, a new party would arise in its place. Now, let me say to Illinois Republicans, and to Republicans everywhere, that, in this matter, he was willing to hazard the defeat of the Republican party, and its utter demoralization and destruction, rather than the defeat of Judge DOUGLAS. This was the pertinacity with which he adhered to the political fortunes of Judge DOUGLAS.

I now propose to read another letter in relation to the position occupied by Mr. Greeley in that great contest. It is a letter addressed to myself, dated Springfield, Illinois, December 26, 1859, written by Mr. Powell, who was the former superintendent of public schools in our State.

Mr. McCLEARNAND. He is a Republican, is he not?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. He is a good and true Republican. His letter reads as follows:

“SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS,
“December 26, 1859.

“DEAR SIR: During the pendency of the struggle upon the Leecompton bill in the House of Representatives, in the spring of 1858, I saw several letters from Mr. Greeley to Republicans in this State, commending the course of Mr. DOUGLAS in his opposition to the nefarious and wicked scheme of forcing a pro-slavery Constitution down the throats of an outraged people.

“In one of those letters, directed to Mr. John O. Johnson, then writing in my office, (that of Superintendent of Public Instruction,) Mr. Greeley expressed it as his decided opinion that, both from motives of policy and

as a matter of strict justice to Mr. DOUGLAS himself, the Republicans of Illinois ought to unite with the friends of Mr. DOUGLAS in returning him to the Senate.

“Mr. Greeley's letter was regarded at the time by the whole Republican State Administration here as a most remarkable political document, both on account of the recommendation it contained, and the source from which it came.

“After a full and free consultation with the Republican State officers, Mr. Johnson replied at length to Mr. Greeley's letter, stating the objections entertained, so far as he knew, by the Republicans of Illinois, to Mr. Greeley's recommendations; and closed the letter by saying that he was authorized to state that the whole Republican State Administration were *unanimously and unalterably opposed to any coalition with Mr. DOUGLAS* looking to his return to the Senate, as they had no confidence whatever in either the man or his profession of principles—a prognostication which I think has been sufficiently verified by Mr. DOUGLAS's recent course to satisfy even Mr. Greeley himself.

“A number of letters are in the hands of leading Republicans in this State, in which Mr. Greeley expressed views similar to those communicated to Mr. Johnson.

“Mr. Greeley, as he says in his article in the *Tribune*, may not have entered into any specific bargain with Mr. DOUGLAS, agreeing to help return Mr. DOUGLAS to the Senate, in case he continued his opposition to the Leecompton measure; but that he did endeavor to bring about such a result, *there is an abundance of evidence in the hands of the Republicans of this State to satisfy any candid and honest man.*

“My sense of justice impels me to place this statement of facts at your disposal, hoping it may aid you in vindicating yourself against the outrageous and unwarranted assaults made upon you through the columns of the *Tribune*.

“I have the honor to be, very respectfully,
&c., W. H. POWELL.

“Hon. William Kellogg,
“Washington, D. C.”

Mr. Powell was Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Mr. Johnson, to whom the letter referred to was addressed, was Secretary of the Republican State Central Committee. Hence it was a letter addressed politically and officially in that capacity to the Republicans of Illinois, and is the most direct and unequivocal interference on the part of Mr. Greeley to carry the State of Illinois for Judge DOUGLAS. It may be said that Judge DOUGLAS never knew this. Then let the gentleman wait until I shall have introduced another part of the evidence to sustain my proposition as against him.

I now propose, Mr. Chairman, to read an ex-

tract from a DOUGLAS paper. It is taken from the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, which I understand—though I may be mistaken—is the DOUGLAS organ in the State of Ohio. It gives the statement of Mr. Lincoln in reference to the fact whether Mr. Greeley was for Judge DOUGLAS or not. It is the statement of a man who, best of all men, could and would be likely to know who were his friends, and who his enemies, in that great conflict in Illinois, in 1858. He gives the evidence in favor of the proposition I made, that Mr. Greeley was for Judge DOUGLAS in that campaign. It has additional force from the fact, that being the opinion of Mr. Lincoln, it is quoted and published in the DOUGLAS papers to show the power that DOUGLAS has in managing both friends and foes. Here is the article:

“LINCOLN’S OPINION OF DOUGLAS’S CHANCES AT CHARLESTON.—William H. Gill, the editor of the Leavenworth (Kansas) *Herald*, lately travelled in Illinois with Abraham Lincoln, DOUGLAS’s competitor for the Senate. Mr. Gill says:

“We inquired of him what he thought of DOUGLAS’s chances at Charleston. ‘Well,’ he replied, ‘were it not for certain matters that I know transpired, which I regarded at one time among the impossibilities, I would say he stood no possible chance. I refer,’ said he, ‘to the fact that, in the Illinois contest with myself, he had the sympathy and support of Greeley, of BURLINGAME and WILSON of Massachusetts, and other leading Republicans; that, at the same time, he received the support of Wise and BRECKINRIDGE, and other Southern men; that he took direct issue with the Administration, and secured, against all its power, one hundred and twenty-five thousand out of the one hundred and thirty thousand Democratic votes cast in the State. A man,” he continued, “that can bring such influences to bear with his own exertions, may play the d—l at Charleston.””

That, sir, was published to show the strength of Judge DOUGLAS, and it is proved by the declaration of Mr. Lincoln.

I have also a letter addressed to me by Mr. Pangborn, of the State of Massachusetts, confirming the proposition that Senator WILSON and other Republicans of the East were in favor of the election of Judge DOUGLAS, and that they aided him, as I believe, materially, in securing the result of that election. I will send it to the Clerk’s desk to be read.

The Clerk read the letter, as follows:

“WASHINGTON, March 3, 1860.

“DEAR SIR: Inquiries having been made in regard to the impression that prevailed in Massachusetts among the Republicans, in relation to the position of Senator DOUGLAS, during and subsequent to the so-called Leecompton contest in the Thirty-fifth Congress, and in relation to the attitude of the two great parties in relation to the Senatorial

canvass in Illinois, I am able, in reply, to state:

“That, at that time, many Republicans in New England were induced to believe that Mr. DOUGLAS had resolved to abandon the Democratic and join the Republican party; and, entertaining that belief, they condemned the Illinois Republicans for having nominated Mr. Lincoln in opposition to Mr. DOUGLAS.

“I remember that Senator WILSON, of Massachusetts, was especially earnest in the expression of his opinion to this effect. He frequently remarked, and in the hearing of many persons, that ‘he knew that Mr. DOUGLAS was all right;’ that ‘he intended to act with the Republicans;’ that ‘the Republicans of Illinois had committed a fatal mistake in running Mr. Lincoln, and in opposing Mr. DOUGLAS’s re-election; and that, but for his course of action, DOUGLAS would certainly be with the Republican party in 1860.’ He often stated that this was understood at Washington; and he freely and emphatically criticised the action of Mr. Lincoln’s friends, and declared his own confidence in the purpose of Mr. DOUGLAS to leave the Democratic party and unite with us.

“Some other gentlemen, who had been at Washington during the Leecompton contest, concurred with Senator WILSON in his opinion; but I think the great majority of the Republicans of Massachusetts distrusted the correctness of Mr. WILSON’s judgment in this case, although they understood that Senator WILSON based his expressed opinion of Mr. DOUGLAS’s position upon his own personal knowledge of that gentleman’s intentions.

“Such was my own understanding, derived from frequent conversations with Senator WILSON and others; and of the main facts herein stated there can be no question, and my recollection of these circumstances can be corroborated by very many of the active and prominent Republicans of Massachusetts.

“You are at liberty to make such use of this letter as you may deem proper.

“I remain, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Z. K. PANGBORN.

“Hon. William Kellogg.”

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there is great significance in that letter. It requires more than ordinary attention. I have proved that Mr. WILSON was in conference and consultation at Judge DOUGLAS’s own house. I have proved that, after these conferences, a member from Massachusetts upon this floor espoused the cause of Judge DOUGLAS. I now prove, by this letter, that Senator WILSON, after going to his Eastern home, looking down upon the fight that was being had upon the prairies of Illinois, charged that we were wrong, in strong and severe language; that DOUGLAS ought to have been elected, and that he knew reasons why DOUGLAS should have been our choice. He is proved to have been in a con-

dition to know DOUGLAS's position; and knowing that, I never doubted Senator WILSON's integrity of motive in the advice he gave, though it was damaging to us in its effects, but did doubt his estimate of the man. Having proved this condition of things, now I prove that he proclaimed in Massachusetts that he *knew* that DOUGLAS would be with us, and that we had made a great mistake in that matter. How did the Senator speak? As a mere matter of opinion? Certainly not. He spoke as a matter of knowledge. He declared that he *knew* it, and censured the Republicans, who were making that gallant fight, for not taking up their adversary, and leaving the honored, the patriotic, and glorious Lincoln to his fate and defeat.

Now, sir, there is another thing in that letter to which I wish to call the attention of the Committee. Many other Republicans in the State of Massachusetts, basing their opinions upon what they learned in Washington, were clearly in favor of our taking Judge DOUGLAS and making him our Senator. That was the aid and sympathy that we got from Eastern politicians; and when I dared to indicate it to this House, I brought down the anathemas of the *Tribune* and of the DOUGLAS men upon me for making the charge that we were unfairly dealt by in that great struggle by Republican politicians outside of our State? Have I proved it? Do you believe, from this proof, that WILSON was in consultation with DOUGLAS? Do you believe that WILSON knew whereof he spake? Why, sir, he had the means of knowing, and said he knew! That is the support that Western Republicans get, when they make their utmost efforts to wheel their State into line as a Republican State.

I close this class of evidence against Mr. Greeley. I have proved my charge upon him and upon other Republicans. I leave that branch of the subject. I would like, however, to reply, for a moment, to what I esteem the immoral and dishonest proposition of Mr. Greeley in relation to the admiration that he now has for Mr. DOUGLAS. He states that there is one tie left between him and Judge DOUGLAS, and that is his admiration of the pluck of the little giant. He says that if DOUGLAS had recommended Tom Paine's Age of Reason, however inadvertently, he would never have retracted it. I had learned, sir, all my life, that the most honorable act a man could perform was, when he had done a wrong, to make retraction and redress; but when a man has committed a violation of morals, when he has recommended heresy against the statutes of the living God, we are told by Greeley that he is an honorable man if he will only stand to it, and defy his adversaries. Sir, a man who would send heresy broadcast through the land, poisoning the minds of our youths, and debauching those of men of riper years, and then refuse to retract, such a man would stab virtue to the heart; would blot out the moral lights

around him, and, in the darkness of that moral night, would congratulate himself upon the ruin he had wrought. Such a man should be, and in my judgment is, the good man's hate and the just man's scorn.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to the other branch of this case, and shall discuss for a little time that which I think convicts Judge DOUGLAS himself. But before I do that, I desire to remark, that under all these seductions, under all these efforts on the part of Republicans outside of Illinois, there is one thing upon which I congratulate myself. I congratulate you, sir; I congratulate my Senator, [Mr. TRUMBULL,] that when these propositions were made, not one Republican of Illinois was found who would entertain them for a moment. They had to go outside the State to make coalitions. I remember having frequent consultations with Senator TRUMBULL, with you, sir, my colleague, WASHBURN, and with LOVEJOY, and with FARNSWORTH, and that we, upon every occasion, denounced the proposition and repudiated it; and but for that, and the manly support we received from our friends at home, we should have been broken, ruined, and demoralized as a party in Illinois. The people appreciated our course; and when we went to our constituents, and met the warm grasp of the hand of the honest laboring men, they did congratulate you, sir, and me, and our colleagues, that we had not been seduced; and, Greeley to the contrary notwithstanding, the Republicans of Illinois will sustain men, and will only sustain them, when they fight for principle on an issue fairly and honorably made.

I wish now to recur to the letter of Judge DOUGLAS. My colleague [Mr. McCLEARNAND] found it necessary, in the discharge of his duty, to have placed upon the records of this House the following letter of Judge DOUGLAS:

"DECEMBER 7, 1859.

"MY DEAR SIR: Your note is just received, informing me that Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois, in the course of a discussion in the House of Representatives, to-day, made the following charge against me.

"Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I charge that Mr. Greeley was again and again, with others, in consultation in the parlor of Judge DOUGLAS, planning and scheming the election of Judge DOUGLAS to the Senate of the United States from the State of Illinois."

"Now, while it is true that men of all shades of political opinion have been in the habit of visiting at my house for the ten years I have kept house in Washington, and while it may be true that Mr. Greeley, among others, may have visited at my house within that time, it is wholly untrue that I ever planned or schemed, or had any arrangement whatever, with Mr. Greeley, at my house or elsewhere, for the purpose of securing my re-election to the Senate of the United States. On the con-

'trary, the charge, in all its parts and import, is utterly false.

"Very truly, your friend, S. A. DOUGLAS.

"Hon. J. A. McClelland,

"House of Representatives."

The courtly language of the Senator may be appropriate in the other end of the Capitol. He says that the statement in its import is false. Now, sir, let me for one moment put side by side the letter of Judge DOUGLAS and that of Horace Greeley. Judge DOUGLAS says that Greeley might have visited his house; that gentlemen of all shades of political opinion were in the habit of visiting his house; and there leaves the matter of Greeley's visit to him. Now, sir, the clear import of that is, the fair construction of that language is, a denial that Greeley was ever with him, consulting in relation to political matters; otherwise he could not by his denial have proved that what I said was false, when I said he was there consulting in relation to political matters.

Mr. McCLELLAND. I did not understand you to say, upon your responsibility, that the charge was true. You stated it from hearsay.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Yes, sir; but I was arguing upon the subject of these letters, and I will not be drawn off from them. I was stating that the legitimate inference of the letter of Judge DOUGLAS was a denial that Greeley was ever in his house upon political subjects. Yet Greeley says he was there twice, consulting with Judge DOUGLAS himself. Now, then, if Judge DOUGLAS's letter was to any extent a refutation of my charge, is not Greeley's letter an absolute refutation of the only reasonable construction to be placed upon the letter of Judge DOUGLAS? Place these letters side by side, and the import of one is directly opposed to the import of the other. One or the other either sought to deceive a casual reader, or else they come in conflict with each other in point of fact.

Now, sir, Judge DOUGLAS says my statement is false in its import—that it is false in every point of view. I ask, is it false that Greeley was there? I ask, is it false that WILSON was there? I ask, is it false that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COLFAX] was there? I ask, is it false that they were meeting there with Senators, in consultation and in caucus? Let honest men judge. If Judge DOUGLAS is not mistaken in the import or character of his letter, then I am mistaken vastly in my judgment of what language means. But I leave that matter.

I now propose to show what was the position of Judge DOUGLAS, as explained by himself and known to Republicans, upon this great issue of slavery. I propose to show what he induced Republicans to believe, to show what he declared and stated to them was his position, and then I shall have nearly done with these matters. If my friend COVODE has not left the Hall, I will prove by him what was his posi-

tion; and if he has, I will state what he will prove when he comes in.

Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk an extract from a communication that appeared not long since in the *Chicago Journal*, a leading and reliable Republican paper in the State of Illinois, signed, I believe, "H." I wish to say, also, that I have ascertained who the author of that article is. He is a gentleman well known in the city of Washington—a respectable, responsible, and reliable man—and if Judge DOUGLAS desires his name, I am authorized to give it. I ask the Clerk to read the article.

The Clerk read, as follows:

"This train of thought carries me back to the beginning of the Thirty-fifth Congress, when Mr. DOUGLAS broke from the line of policy marked out by Mr. Buchanan for the Democracy, and opposed the Lecompton Constitution. He was under the ban, socially and politically, with the Democrats. The remarkable expressions he used to make about his record—what he had done in the party to stop the progress of slavery and to advance freedom, and what he purposed doing in the future to destroy the intentions of the slave power—will never be erased from my memory, as they never can be from the minds of hundreds of others who heard the same things.

"He said that, when he started out in his opposition to Lecompton, he was merely making fight on a single measure, and not against the party; but a blow at Lecompton was a blow at slavery, and he soon found the whole slave power arrayed against him, like a pack of wolves. In making the fight against this power, he remarked that he was enabled to stand off and view the men with whom he had been acting; that he was ashamed he had ever been caught in such company; that they were a set of unprincipled demagogues, bent upon perpetuating slavery, and, by the exercise of that unequal and unfair power, to control the Government, or break up the Union; and that he intended to prevent their doing either. His denunciations of the fire-eaters were at times very severe, and couched in language fit neither for the parlor nor the newspaper.

"He insisted that he would never be driven from the party, but would remain in it until he exposed the Administration and the disunionists; and when he went out, he would go of his own accord. He was in the habit of remarking that it was policy for him to remain in the party, in order to hold certain of the rank and file, so that if he went over from the Democracy to any other party, he would be able to take the crowd along with him; and when he got them all over, he would cut down the bridges, and sink the boats.

"On one occasion, I waited upon him to ascertain if the report was true that he and

‘Buchanan had had an interview for the purpose of settling their dispute. I said to him that, as the correspondent of a leading Republican organ, I had represented him fairly, and the report, if true, tended to compromise my position, and I thought, therefore, that I was entitled to a fair answer to a fair question.’

‘I asked him to say to me frankly if there was any truth in the report. Putting a hand on each shoulder, and looking me square in the face, he said: ‘I authorize you to say that there is not a word of truth in the report.’ Adding, that there never would be any union between him and Buchanan, unless the latter saw fit to come to him and stand by his side on the platform of popular sovereignty.’

‘In the interview he repeated many things that he had said before, to convince me and others that he was earnestly and honestly on the side of the North, against the slave power, and should be found fighting in the ranks of the great Northern party in 1860. In this interview he also used an expression which a distinguished Republican member of the Thirty-fifth Congress informed me he used to him in a conversation he held with him at the commencement of the Leecompton struggle, to ascertain his views concerning his (DOUGLAS’s) future intentions. After talking a while with DOUGLAS, I inquired of him if he knew where his present course (meaning his opposition to Leecompton) would lead him. DOUGLAS replied, with emphasis, ‘I do: and I have checked all my baggage, and taken a through ticket.’

‘In using this expression to me, as he did several times, he conveyed to my mind, as I think he intended to do, that he was going from the Democratic party, over bag and baggage, to the Republicans—a great Northern party, as he used to call it. All who conversed with him at that time, and during the Leecompton struggle, who related their interviews with him to me, received the same impressions from his conversations that I did; and the number was not only large, growing out of my position here, but they embraced some of the leading Senators and Representatives in Congress, representatives of leading Republican journals of the country, as well as many of the most distinguished citizens of the different States. So thoroughly impressed were some of the leading and most sagacious members of Congress that Mr. DOUGLAS was ‘all right,’ that they not only deemed it wise policy for the Republicans of the State of Illinois to take ‘hands off,’ and allow Mr. DOUGLAS to be returned to the Senate, but they urged such action as a matter of justice, and even went so far as to censure the Republicans of Illinois for not following such advice, and, in many instances, charged them with being false to their principles and sentiments, and sometimes, in the heat of discussion, made use of opprobrious epithets. As an

evidence that I do not mean to charge others with doing wrong, I am free to say that, so thoroughly was I convinced that the gentlemen who gave this advice were right, and the Republicans of Illinois wrong, that I urged the same thing. I am now, however, satisfied that they were right.

‘Mr. DOUGLAS’s plan for destroying the Missouri line, and thereby opening the way for the march of freedom beyond the limits forever prohibited by the existence of that line, and the opening up of free States in territory which it was conceded belonged to the slave States, and its march westward, embracing the whole line of the Pacific, from the British possessions to Mexico, struck me as the most magnificent scheme ever conceived by the human mind. This character of conversation, so frequently employed by Mr. DOUGLAS with those with whom he talked, made the deepest impression upon their minds, enlisted them in his behalf, and changed, in almost every instance, their opinion of the man. While it is not surprising that the men who were in the daily habit of hearing Mr. DOUGLAS give expression to his sentiments, should have given the advice they did to the Illinois Republicans, it is surprising that they should now deny it. More remarkable is the fact that none of the interviews I ever had with Judge DOUGLAS, on the subject of his political position, were confidential. On the contrary, I always talked with him as a member of the press, he being fully aware of my position.

‘But I am making this letter longer than I intended, and may have occasion to revert to the subject again soon. H.”

Mr. McCLEARNAND. Will my colleague give the author and the date of that letter?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. The date is Washington, February 23, 1860.

Mr. McCLEARNAND. That is since your speech.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Yes, sir; since.

Mr. McCLEARNAND. What is the name of the author?

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. It is signed H. I have already stated that I was authorized to give the name of the writer, if Judge DOUGLAS desires it.

Mr. McCLEARNAND. I ask for the name now.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Does Judge DOUGLAS authorize you to ask for it?

Mr. McCLEARNAND. I will take the responsibility.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. If you ask it with his authority, you shall have it.

Mr. McCLEARNAND. I take that responsibility as his friend, and I denounce it as a manufactured statement, and the evidence of a straw man.

Mr. LOGAN. Give us the name.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I will give the name of a gentleman who gave a not more

flattering account of the political position of Senator DOUGLAS, in a speech delivered at Alton, Illinois, in 1855, if my colleague [Mr. McCLEARNAND] desires it.

Mr. LOGAN. Give us the name of the author of the letter which was just read.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this article in relation to the principles of Judge DOUGLAS discloses the fact that the Republicans did know, and had the means of knowing, the position of Judge DOUGLAS upon the question of slavery as stated by himself. It further discloses that he was in communication with the Republicans, and, whether designedly or not, he did lay such a basis for his political *status* as would induce the Republicans to urge his re-election, and such as did not induce many Republicans to censure the Republicans of Illinois for not taking him up, because, as they said, they knew he was "all right." Here, sir, is the reason for the opinion of Senator WILSON, and there is the basis for the opinion which was prevalent in Massachusetts. That is doubtless what induced Greeley to take his position, and to denounce the Republicans of Illinois because they did not adopt Mr. DOUGLAS as their candidate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask, how could any man doubt, from the position he took, that he had left the Democratic party, that he had broken away from it, but that he would not go out of it altogether until he could gather round him the rank and file to carry them across the water? Sir, it was upon that state of things, which DOUGLAS himself disclosed to this correspondent, that BURLINGAME made the declaration, that they had kept the "whiteness of their souls," and that their "record was laid in light." He induced them to believe that he was going with us, and that, in the language of Senator WILSON, he was "all right," and would be with us. Look, sir, for one moment, at the graphic picture which he drew of his own condition. He said that he had checked his baggage through. What baggage? It was his political jewels, his political capital, his political hopes. He had sent that baggage before him, out of the reach of the storm that was coming; and as his baggage had gone ahead of him, he looked back to see, in his own language, the Democratic party, like a pack of wolves, upon his track. He declared, with his baggage safe, that he would stand upon the border of Democracy until he could gather around him his few followers, when he would leave the Democratic shore, cross the river, cut down bridges, and sink the boats. [Laughter.] That is the figure of the Illinois Senator in reference to the Democracy he was about to leave. He always uses expressive language. He always indulges in strong figures. Clapping a hand upon each shoulder of this correspondent, he used this language. Who could doubt, save those who knew him best, that he was our ally, and prepared to fight our battles? I have just proved

that the Republicans and DOUGLAS conferred, and that they understood each other's position.

I now come to another branch of this case. I ask the Clerk to read the letter of Mr. Blair, which has been published in the papers, with his name appended to it.

The Clerk read, as follows:

"St. Louis, October 25, 1858.

"DEAR SIR: I have received your note, putting certain interrogatories to me in reference to the conversation held by Judge DOUGLAS and myself at his home, last winter. It has always been a principle with me to hold sacred every private conversation between any gentleman and myself, and this will forbid my saying anything in answer to the questions you have asked. Although Mr. DOUGLAS, by his conduct to me, and by the unscrupulous attacks of his partisans, has forfeited all claims on my forbearance, yet I do not consider that, because others have failed to conform to the proprieties of life, it furnishes an excuse for me to follow their example.

"After what has been said, however, it is just and proper to myself to say, that the letter which was written by me to Mr. B. Gratz Brown, of the Missouri Democrat, and which has been the basis of the assaults made on me by Mr. DOUGLAS's partisans for violating an alleged confidence, was written in strict accordance with the wishes of Judge DOUGLAS himself. In fact, I deemed it to be the single object of the interview to which I was invited, to mitigate, through me, the hostility of the radical Democratic press of St. Louis towards him. I wrote for this purpose, believing it to be his desire, and I had no agency whatever in giving currency to the rumors about the contents of letters which have found their way into the newspapers. The blackguardism of the newspapers in the interest of Mr. DOUGLAS, on this account, compels me to make this explanation, and is the only occasion for my writing a word on the subject.

"I have said I was invited to this interview by Judge DOUGLAS. I say so, to repel the idea that I sought an interview with him upon political subjects. The invitation and message came through Hon. SCHUYLER COLFAX, of Indiana, and has never, to my knowledge, been treated as a private matter. I take the occasion to say, that neither the message sent me, nor anything that ever occurred between Judge DOUGLAS and myself, prepared me for hearing of his calling for three cheers over the defeat of the Emancipationists of Missouri, and my own defeat, by the pro-slavery Le-compton-Buchanan Democracy of Missouri.

"Yours, &c., FRANK P. BLAIR, Jun.

"Isaac H. Sturgeon, Esq."

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I have had that letter read for the purpose of showing that Judge DOUGLAS himself sought political interviews with Mr. Blair, and to contradict the in-

ference which gentlemen may attempt to draw, that all this was carried on behind the back of Judge DOUGLAS for his political benefit, and that he knew nothing about it. It appears by this letter, that Judge DOUGLAS desired interviews with Mr. Blair, and sought, through him, to turn away the attacks of the Democracy upon him. And while he was doing this, and while he sought the aid of the Republicans to ward off the attacks made upon him, there is disclosed the further fact that there was a private interview, of which he will not speak, and to which I do not refer; for I have not, nor will I, ask any man to make any explanation of a private matter, unless he voluntarily commences and details a portion of it. It is shown that Judge DOUGLAS sought the aid of Republicans to turn away the assaults of the Democracy upon him, and sought an interview with Mr. Blair, in relation to political matters. Judge DOUGLAS knows the character of those interviews; and when he desires that an explanation shall be made, I have no doubt that Mr. Blair and my friend [Mr. COLFAX] will make a clean breast of it, and will tell what did occur and transpire between them. Until that is done, I will make no inference or suggestion as to what the subject of that private interview was.

Now, having done this much, I will call upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania—[Mr. COVODE]—he was here a short time ago, and I requested him to remain when I commenced my remarks. As he is not here now, I will say what he will state when he comes in. Mr. COVODE was here during the winter when this Lecompton question was under consideration—one of the National Republican Committee. I assert that Mr. COVODE said to me, and said he would state it here—and that was the reason I asked him to remain—what transpired between him and Judge DOUGLAS in relation to this matter. I asked him if it was confidential, and he said it was not; and he will state when he comes in, I venture to say, that Judge DOUGLAS himself came into this Hall, and asked him to go to Judge TRUMBULL, our Senator, and induce him to persuade or advise the Republicans of Illinois to consent to his return to the Senate; that he might remain here to fight the Administration; that he was a young man, and could wait for his chance; and that he might be expected to be fighting our battles in 1860. Mr. COVODE told me that that was substantially what was said, and he would state it upon this floor.

I would like to have said a few words more, in relation to some other matters, but the rap of the Chairman's hammer admonishes me that I have again exhausted much more than the time allowed by the rules of the House. I return my thanks to gentlemen who have kindly given me their attention to that which concerns the Republicans of Illinois and the Democracy of that region more directly, perhaps, than gentlemen from other parts of the country.

APPENDIX.

The following are the extracts from a speech delivered by the Hon. JOHN A. McCLEARNAND, at the city of Alton, in 1854, which Mr. KELLOGG proposed to read in the House of Representatives, on the conclusion of Mr. McCLEARNAND's remarks in reply to him, but was prevented, objections having been made.

Mr. McCLEARNAND said:

"And why should fealty to the repeal of the Missouri compromise be made a Democratic test now, any more than formerly? That compromise stood upon the statute book for more than thirty years, without an attempt by any party or by any man, as far as I know, to repeal it. It is too late now, to make its repeal a test of political orthodoxy. The attempt to do so is simply an act of senseless and impudent proscription, which will not be tolerated. * * *

"By whose authority, then, is such a test to be instituted? By the authority of Judge Douglas, and for his benefit. For the purpose of coercing a universal conformity to the standard of his orthodoxy—for the purpose of glorifying a paroxysm of his vaulting ambition as a supernatural evidence of his immaculacy—for the purpose of driving every Democrat, *volens volens*, into his support as a Presidential aspirant. For no other purpose that I can see. * * *

"Such is the record, the authentic public record, of the Senator upon the question of the Missouri line—a record covering an angry and eventful period of ten years of slavery agitation. Is it not pregnant with significance? Does it not speak for itself? Does it not prove the Senator to be more thoroughly identified with the principles and policy of the Missouri restriction, than any other man in the world? And in proving this, according to the new test, does it not prove him to be one of the worst abolitionists and most arrant traitors to the Democratic party in the broad Union? How ungrateful, that the Senator, after riding down his old and favorite slatkins horse, should now indignantly dismount from him, and, stripping him of his gay trappings, denounce him as a ringbone, spavined, swained, sore-back, hybrid beast, fit only for an incendiary abolitionist to ride, or to draw the car of some underground railroad? But, alas for poor frail human nature! The Senator says he has changed, that he has turned from the error of his ways, and is now for non-intervention and self-government in the Territories. I am glad to hear it. Better late than never. I welcome him to the true faith, but would exhort him to greater humility. As a new convert, it is not decent or proper for him to aspire so soon to become a class leader. He should be content, according to the rules of the Democratic church, to occupy the anxious seat, at least until we can

‘ see whether his conversion is real or imaginary—whether a returning paroxysm of ambition may not relapse him into the wickedness of his former ways. * * *

‘ April 19th, the committee of thirteen was chosen by ballot; Clay chairman, and Cass, Dickinson, Webster, and others, members of the committee; and thus terminated the most memorable struggle recorded in our legislative annals—an intense and anxious struggle of more than two months duration, in which our Senators co-operated with Chase, Corwin, Hale, and Seward, abolition leaders, against Cass and Clay, and against the compromise move of 1850, and not for it, as many honest people have been induced to believe; and after the Senate had thus affirmed the unity and dependence, one upon another, of the several elements of the slavery question, and after the compromise move had eventuated in a combined series of measures, framed in a spirit of mutual concession, and designed to give repose to the country, our Senators, strangely enough, notoriously hesitated and equivocated in their support of the series—sometimes adhering to Benton, sometimes to Cass, but finally voting for the broken wrecks of the series, except the fugitive slave law, which they both dodged; acting, no doubt, upon the Hudibrastic philosophy, that

‘ He who fights and runs away
May live to fight another day;
But he who fights and is in battle slain
Ne’er will live to fight again.’

‘ In these remarks, gentlemen, I have not indulged in any stricture upon the action of our Senators, from any feeling of personal hostility. On the contrary; I have endeavored to be just rather than censorious. I accord to both of those gentlemen many merits. One of them has proved himself to be a gallant soldier, and I honor him as a hero. The

‘ other is able, active, and aspiring, and I admire him for his talents. It is not that I love Caesar less, but I love Rome more, that I have censured in justice, and not in malice, some of their actions. But I am not unaware that my motives will not afford me a protection against the shafts of malice and detraction. Already I have been denounced as a disorganizer and an abolitionist, conspiring with others against the unity and integrity of the Democratic party. And, forsooth, for what? Not because I am not for adhering to the Kansas Nebraska act, but because I will not bend the knee to Baal—because I will not unman myself, and, prostrated upon the earth, worship not a God, nor a Demigod, but a ‘Little Giant.’ Never! I am the peer of the Senator. As one of the sovereign people, I am the peer of kings and of lords, and never will I consent to such debasement. Me an abolitionist? The statement is simply untrue, and nobody believes it—not even the slanderer himself. I never boasted, in Springfield or elsewhere, that I had voted spontaneously, of my own choice, for the Wilmot proviso; I never was either the accoucheur or the nurse of the Missouri restriction; I never sought to gag either branch of Congress with that restriction, by conspiracy and the previous question or otherwise; I never proclaimed that it had become canonized in the hearts of the American people, as a sacred thing which no ruthless hand would be reckless enough to disturb. No, I never did or said any of these things; on the contrary, I have opposed, from first to last, the principles and policy of the Missouri line; and at one time stood alone from the North, or nearly so, in the popular branch of Congress, in opposition to the *‘Wilmot proviso.’* Can the Senator say as much?” * * *

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

1860.



